

DIRECTION 113

MORPHIDAE (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA):
FURTHER CORRECTION TO OFFICIAL LIST ENTRY

RULING.— (1) The entry against Name No. 225 in the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology is hereby corrected to read: MORPHIDAE (correction of Morphites) Newman, E., 1834 [remainder of entry unchanged].

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) Morphites Newman, 1834, an incorrect original spelling of MORPHIDAE (Name Number 493);
- (b) Morphoidae J.L.R. Agassiz, 1847, an unjustified emendation of Morphides Boisduval, 1836, itself an incorrect subsequent spelling of MORPHIDAE (Name Number 494).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.) 2201

An error in the authorship and date attributed to the lepidopteran family name MORPHIDAE in entry No. 225 in the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology was first drawn to the Commission's attention by Lt-Col. C.F. Cowan (*Grange-over-Sands, England*) on 14 October 1976. He asked that that name should be attributed not to 'Westwood, [1851]' but to 'Boisduval, 1836'. His paper was sent to the printer on 19 April 1977 and published on 31 August 1977 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34, pp. 109–111. No use of the plenary powers was involved; no comments were received.

On 23 November 1979 a correction to his original application was received from Lt-Col. Cowan. Dr Gerardo Lamas had drawn to his attention an earlier publication of the name MORPHIDAE (as 'Morphites') by Newman, 1834. A revised application was sent to the printer on 15 April 1980 and published on 25 September 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 134–135. No use of the plenary powers was involved; no comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 6 October 1981 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (81)27 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 134–135. At the close of the voting period on 6 January 1982 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — eighteen (18) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Sabrosky, Willink,

Trjapitzin, Corliss, Brinck, Tortonese, Hahn, Lehtinen, Alvarado, Habe, Binder, Dupuis, Nye, Welch, Bayer

Negative Vote — Heppell.

Late affirmative votes were received from Halvorsen and Starobogatov and a late negative vote from Ride. Vokes abstained. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Kraus and Cogger.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their votes:

Heppell: 'When errors of fact are detected concerning entries on the Official Lists, but when the error does not affect the interpretation of the nominal taxon concerned, the entry should be subject to automatic correction after due notice has been given without the necessity of a formal application and a Commission vote. In the case of family-group names there is no question of more than one nominal taxon being involved as A-IDAE will always be interpreted by reference to its type genus *A-us* Smith, 1800, whatever the date or authorship of A-IDAE and whatever the type species of *A-us*. It is thus the concept of A-IDAE that is enshrined in the Official List and the date and authorship merely regulate its priority relative to other family-group names. Suppose an application was before the Commission to substitute A-IDAE Smith, 1840 for the entry A-IDAE Brown, 1850, placed on the Official List without use of the plenary powers. What if the Commission returned an "against" vote? Would not A-IDAE Smith, 1840, nevertheless be the valid name for the family, just as B-IDAE Green, 1830, would be if it were shown to be a senior synonym?

'In most zoological groups the dates and authorships of family-group names are poorly known as it was the common practice to use the name based on the most senior valid generic name included in the family or subfamily and not on the relative priority of the family-group names themselves. For this reason the continual discovery of earlier usages of family-group names than those presently known must be expected, even for names already added to the Official List. With the further possibility of acceptance, after proper latinization of the termination, of names coined in the vernacular, the dating of family-group names becomes even more open to varying opinion. Article 11e(iii) allows the acceptance of such a name published before 1900 with its original date and authorship provided that it has been "generally accepted ... as dating from its first publication in vernacular form". Surely the implication of this provision is that a specified vernacular usage may be accepted if the remaining conditions are met. In the present case the applicant seems to have interpreted this Article as referring to the first publication in vernacular form whatever that may at any time prove to be. The

argument for authorship of MORPHIDAE earlier than Doubleday, already extremely tenuous in that it seems to depend on a single reference in Agassiz's *Index Universalis* being taken as evidence of general acceptance of MORPHIDAE taking priority from Boisduval's MORPHIDES, is completely vitiated by the substitution of Newman's MORPHITES which is so far from general acceptance that it had been totally overlooked until after the publication of the application.

Finally I would point out that "MORPHOIDES Agassiz, 1847" is an error for "MORPHOIDAE Agassiz, 1847". Although this error is evident from the original application it has been repeated in the emended proposals (vol. 37, p. 135) and is not corrected on the voting paper. Fortunately Agassiz's emendation is later than Doubleday's correctly formed name, of which it is a junior objective synonym, but in any case would have been an incorrect original spelling not in general current use, as the stem of *Morpho* is *Morph-* and MORPHIDAE is the only possible spelling of the family name derived from it.'

Ride: 'Article 11e(iii) requires that a name not fully latinized must have been generally accepted as dating "from its first publication in vernacular form". No argument has been presented that MORPHIDAE is accepted as dating from *Morphites* Newman, 1834. The decision that the Commission is being asked to take would require the use of the plenary powers to set aside the normal operation of that provision. Neither stability nor universality would be served by such an action.'

Note by the Secretary: I took '*Morphites*' not as an English vernacular, but as fully latinized though with an incorrect termination. As such, it would be covered by Article 11e(ii) and I believe the correct procedure has been followed. R.V.M.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for an amended entry in an Official List and for names placed on an Official Index by the decision taken in the present Direction:

MORPHIDAE Newman, E., 1834 (correction of *Morphites*),
Entomol. Mag. vol. 2 (4), pp. 379, 381

Morphites Newman, E., 1834, *Entomol. Mag.* vol. 2 (4), pp. 379, 381

Morphoidae J.L.R. Agassiz, *Nomencl. zool., Index univ.*, 4^o edn, p. 239.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(81)27 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Direction No. 113.

R. V. MELVILLE

Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London

28 April 1982